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1.0 Introduction: hypotheses about Makuva

The new republic of East Timor lies on the eastern half of the island of Timor, which lies at the end of the Minor Sunda Islands Chain on the border of the Indonesian provinces of Nusa Tenggara Timur and Maluku. It contains thirteen districts where sixteen indigenous languages are spoken that belong to two different language families. Twelve of them are Austronesian and the remaining four are so-called ‘Non-Austronesian’ or ‘Papuan’. For an overview of the genetics of these languages, we refer to Hull (1998, 2004b). In this paper we want to focus on the ‘sixteenth language’ of East Timor, which is known in the literature under the names of Loikera (Riedel 1886), Lóvaia or Lóvaia Epulu (as in Ferreira 1951b and Hajek, Himmelmann and Bowden 2003), Maku’a (Sudana et al. 1996) and Makuva (Hull and Branco 2003). The term Loikera or Lokeria is a name in Southwest Malukan mythology that refers to an important port in Timor and from which the ancestors from some clans on Kisar Island originated (cf. footnote 1 in Christensen and Christensen 1992:33). In this paper we will follow the latter authors and use the name Makuva to refer to this language, which is spoken in the Tutuala subdistrict in the extreme of East Timor’s easternmost district, Lautem. Beside Makuva, three other languages are spoken in this district that are all acknowledged as ‘non-Austronesian’. The majority language is Fataluku with five dialects: East (Tutuala and Mehara), Central (Kom, Fuiloru, Home, Souru, Lospalos, Mu’apitine, Lopoloho), Lorehe dialect, Lautem dialect and Northwest (Maina-Satu, Maina-Dua, Serelau, Badur). Makalero is mainly spoken in and around Iliomar bordering on Vikeke District. Along the border with Baukau District Makasae dialects are spoken (eg. Laivai and Luro).

At least two other languages used to be spoken in the region. In a personal communication, Andrew McWilliam (2007a) at the Australian National University informed that Nisa is reportedly spoken until the Second World War in Muapusu in Kom territory by the Kati Ratu clans and their subsidiary clans. Based on the small wordlist provided by McWilliam, this language can be easily recognised as a Fataluku dialect. In January 2007, I was told about a

---

1 This paper is based on research in the field from 2003 through 2012 within the frameworks of the Maku’a Pilot Project (funded by the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme, grant no. Ppg 002, 2003), the Fataluku Language Project (funded by the Netherlands Scientific Organisation, grant no. 256-70-560, 2005-2008), the Translating Culture, Culture of Translation Project (funded by the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, project no. PTDC/ANT/81065/2006, 2006-2010), and 2009-2012 The project Becoming a nation of readers in East Timor: Language policy and adult literacy development in a multilingual context (funded by The Netherlands Scientific Organisation and the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research in the Tropics, grant no. W 01.65.315.00, 2009-2012). Parts of this paper have been presented at the International Conference on Moribund Languages and Cultures, Petaling Jaya, Selangor, Malaysia, October 14th – 16th, 2008, the 11th International Conference of Austronesian Linguistics, Aussois, France, June 22nd-26th, 2009, the Double Vision duo-presentation on Orality and Tradition, December 8th, 2011, Leiden University, The Netherlands and the Workshop Dynamics of Ritual and Secret Languages, Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences, December 14th, 2012, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
now extinct language that was spoken in Tutuala territory on top of Rusili mountain,\textsuperscript{2} which by some informants was referred to as Rusenu\textsuperscript{3}.

The language under discussion in this paper, Makuva, has also been reported is confined to the Tutuala subdistrict and is generally considered to be nearly extinct. Fereirra (1951a and b) was the first to mention Makuva in an ethnographic note on Tutuala. Capell (1972) was the first to analyse Fereirra’s wordlist. Because of the occurrence of nominal endings like -va, -ki and -kia, Capell suggested that Makuva be ‘non-Austronesian’ like the languages in North Halmera (Capell 1972:103). Although this feature is not shared by the neighbouring ‘non-Austronesian’ language, Fataluku, Capell points out that both languages seem to lack voiced phonemes.

Hull (1998) concludes that Makuva is rather an Austronesian language that is closely related to the Meher language spoken on the island of Kisañ off the north coast of East Timor in Southwest Maluku. Hull explains Capell’s classification to be caused by complicated sound changes that blurred the Austronesian character of the Makuva lexicon. According to Himmelmann and Hajek (2001:96) Makuva’s affiliation to the Austronesian Meher language is confirmed by the fact that both languages have pronominal subject prefixes on their verbs unlike the neighbouring Non-Austronesian languages like Fataluku and Makasae.

Sudana et al. (1996) are the first to provide a sketch of Makuva grammar based on the model developed by the Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa\textsuperscript{4}, the national language authority of Indonesia. Hull and Branco (2003:125, note 16) rightly caution against its many erroneous interpretations and consequently incorrect analyses. The latter publication is the first that contains an extensive list containing 969 items in which all previously published and known unpublished material is combined. The authors elaborate Hull’s (1998) thesis that Makuva is an Austronesian immigrant language from Kisañ Island in Southwest Maluku. By linking the nominal ending -va in Makuva to the generic noun marker -f in the Austronesian Dawan language in West Timor (e.g. Lake 2002:34), Hull and Branco dismiss Capell’s ‘non-Austronesian’ hypothesis. Hajek, Himmelmann and Bowden (2003) follow Hull’s and Branco’s that Makuva is closely related to Southwest Malukan Meher by confirming that “[a]part from the lexical similarities, all three languages (that is: Makuva, Meher and Roma, AvE) share the same set of unusual set of sound correspondences.” (p.157).

Later on, Hull (2004a) acknowledges that Makuva is equally genetically close to Waima’a in the Baukau District as to Meher in Southwest Maluku, because of which he dismisses the previous immigrant hypothesis. Engelenhoven (2009) finally classifies Makuva as an early offshoot of the East Group languages in Proto Extra-Ramelaic, a descendant of Proto Timoric.\textsuperscript{6}

\textsuperscript{2}This mountain has become known for its cave drawings on its eastern slope (O’Connor 2003). The general name in Fataluku for this mountain is \textit{Ili kere-kere} (‘written or scrabbled-on mountain’). The actual meaning of \textit{Rusili} is ‘window mountain’.

\textsuperscript{3}Because Valentim (2002:83) specifically lists Rusenu as a place near the Nari table mountain rather than as the name of a language, we now surmise that Rusenu and Nisa refer to the same language rather than to different languages. See also paragraph 5.

\textsuperscript{4}“Language Development and Cultivation Centre”, nowadays called \textit{Pusat Bahasa} “Language Centre”.

\textsuperscript{5}Their conclusion is based on an unpublished paper by John Hajek (1995) that we have not been able to consult.

\textsuperscript{6}For a discussion on the validity of Proto Central Malayo-Polynesian, the predecessor of Proto Timoric, refer to Adelaar 2005.
2. A sketch of Tutuala subdistrict

Tutuala is the easternmost subdistrict of the Republic of East Timor. It is again subdivided in two main administrative sectors, labeled *suku* in Tetum, Mehara in the West and Tutuala in the East. The famous lake Iralalaru is located in the Mehara *suku* that comprises three villages: Poros, Northwest off the lake, Porlamano and Loikere that are further East up the road, Northeast off the lake.\(^7\) Tutuala *suku* comprises four villages that are located along the road from Mehara *suku* to Valu beach opposite the tiny Jaco islet, respectively Veru, Cailoru, Ioro, Tutuala and Pitileti. According to Carvalho et al. (2007:5-6) who refer to a census held in 2004 in Lautem district, Tutuala subdistrict has a population density of 3.292 persons who are divided in 790 households. The same census informs that 48\% (1.587 people) are women and 52\% (1.705 people) are men. As is conform to the general tradition in East Timor, everybody in Tutuala subdistrict belongs to a clan. In general, membership of a clan is determined

\(^7\)Disagreements about the ownership of the lake and its shores sometimes emerge in more or less official publications. Map 1 displayed in McWilliam (2007b) clearly locates the village of Malahara at the southern shore of Iralalaru lake and the southwestern corner of the lake in the Lospalos district. A map produced by GERTIL (Grupo de Estudos de Reconstrução – Timor Leste, “Research group for the Reconstruction of East Timor” rather locates Malahara and the entire lake in Mehara *suku*.
through patrilineal affiliation\(^8\), although matrilineal descent\(^9\) is also acknowledged as a legitimate affiliation. Palmer and Carvalho (2007) suggest there to be more than ten clans in Tutuala subdistrict. Of these they mention specifically Tutuala Ratu, Cailoru Ratu, Ma’aleki Ratu, Jen i La’i Ratu and Masipani Ratu as the most influential ones (ibidem: footnote 8, p.1324). Table 1 provides a list of all clan names that we have been able to find. The first row provides the ‘daily’ names, whereas the second name contains alternative names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Alternative name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tutuala Ratu</td>
<td>‘One Column clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jen i La’i Ratu</td>
<td>‘Own Master clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma’aleki Ratu</td>
<td>‘Ma’aleki clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cailoru Ratu</td>
<td>‘Cailoru clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masipani Ratu</td>
<td>‘Angry Grasp clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me’ehara maho</td>
<td>‘Me’ehara maho’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tana Ratu</td>
<td>‘Hand clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paiuru Ratu</td>
<td>‘Paddler clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serelau Ratu</td>
<td>‘Beach cloth clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renu Ratu</td>
<td>‘Kingdom clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leti Mecenu Ratu</td>
<td>‘At Leti clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maulenu</td>
<td>‘Maulenu’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitin Malai Ratu</td>
<td>‘White King clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakuvaru Malai Ratu</td>
<td>‘Black King Clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kukulure Ratu</td>
<td>‘Scratch and Sweep clan’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaptenu Ratu</td>
<td>‘Captain clan’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: clans in Tutuala subdistrict

Determining how many clans exist in a region in Lautem district is a difficult task. The informants themselves often do not know in how far different names refer to the same clan. For example, not everybody is aware of the fact that Ma’aleki Ratu is the same clan as Lakuvaru Malai Ratu. Often clan names epitomise events from the clan’s past (Engelenhoven 2008). One example of this is the name of Masipani Ratu, which freely translates as ‘Angry Grasp clan’, which describes how the clan’s ancestor was offered ritual meat in a mythical gathering. Instead of ‘angrily grasping the meat’, the event is also described as ‘scratching away of the meat’ (Gomes 1972:25), which is profiled by the clan’s alternative name: Kukulure Ratu. Also, there is a preference to signal an alliance between clans rather than mentioning a single clan name. As such, one may hear the combination Jen i La’i // Ma’aleki more often in public than just the single names. Whereas most acknowledge that they once have come from abroad, there are in Tutuala subdistrict at least three clans that are considered to be indigenous to the land: Tutuala Ratu in the Tutuala suku and Me’ehara maho, Maulenu and Renu Ratu in Mehara suku. Although no longer generally known, Tutuala Ratu is acknowledged to be related to Kati Ratu, which is the traditional land owner clan of the Lautem and Lospalos subdistricts.\(^{10}\) Me’ehara maho is a leading clan in Mehara suku. Whereas the clan names are generally in Fataluku, the segment maho is generally acknowledged as being a Makuva word and is reported in Pannell (2004) as meaning ‘heap’. Valentim’s (2002) Fataluku dictionary explains this word as ‘a clan’s name’

---

\(^8\) Referred to in Fataluku as ara ho pata (‘base and trunk’, my translation,AvE), cf. McWilliam (2006:259)
\(^{10}\) The names of the administrative units in Lautem district are somewhat confusing. Lautem in first instance refers to the village Lautem that is located on the North shore in the suku of Pairara, which again is part of the Lautem subdistrict.
(p.47) and lists *Me’ehara* as the name of a hill (p.51). Its alternative name, *Kaptenu*, which is derived from the Ambonese malay *kapitan* ‘captain’, indicates that being indigenous to a region does not automatically imply isolation from the outside world. The latter name hints at the belief that the *Me’ehara maho* ancestry is linked to the train of the famous freedom fighter captain Thomas Matulessy on Saparua Island in the Central Moluccans. My main informant of the other Mehara clan mentioned, *Maulenu*, informed that their ancestors were among the original inhabitants of Mehara. As far as we know the only clans that seem confined to Tutuala subdistrict are *Tutuala Ratu, Leti Mecenu Ratu*, *Me’ehara maho* and *Maulenu*. All other clans are said to have come from abroad and are also found elsewhere. *Ma’aleki Ratu* and *Jen i La’i Ratu* acknowledge to originally have immigrated from Roma Island, off the Northcoast in the Indonesian district of Southwest Maluku.

**Cailoru Ratu** is acknowledged to have come initially from across the sea in the East. The general explanation as it emerges in both Fereirra (1951a) and Gomes (1972) is that this name remembers the movements of the clan’s ancestors to evade the attempts of their fellow victims who tried to cling to them during the mythical inundation of the ancestral village *Loina*. Taking into account the attested Fataluku sound correspondence between the post-alveolar or voiced retroflex occlusive [Í] in the Northwest dialect and the voiceless palatal occlusive [c] in all other dialects (Schapper et al. 2012), *Cailoru* may very well be related to *Dailoro* or *Dailora*, a placename that is found on several islands in Southwest Maluku and as such exemplifies old links between *Cailoru Ratu* and the islands offshore. Gomes (1972) lucidly explains how *Cailoru Ratu* is the military and political counterpart force of *Latu Loho Ratu*, which explains its occurrence in the suku of Pairara (Lautem subdistrict), Rasa and Fuiloro (Lospalos subdistrict, Mesakh 2005).

The remaining clans *Renu Ratu, Paiuru Ratu* and *Serelau Ratu* are connected to the lands around Veru River that runs from Tutuala subdistrict to the southwest shore in Mehara subdistrict. McWilliam(2006:274, footnote 38) points out that its is believed that the ancestors of *Renu Ratu* and *Paiuru Ratu* came to the Veru valley by means of a boat. The name *Serelau* also occurs as the name of a suku in Lautem subdistrict in the West where *Serelau Ratu* is an important clan. McWilliam (2006:265) describes how before 1945 the Veru community tried to gain independent administrative status as a suku, which it never achieved because it significantly lost its numerical strength during the postwar period.

### 3. The whereabouts of the Makuva

Ferreira (1951b:8-9), who is the first to write about Makuva, informs that the language “lovaia-epulo” by a hundred or less individuals in the Porlamano hamlet that he located in a suku of Loikere rather than in Mehara. “Lovaia-epulo” is a Portuguese corruption of the Fataluku *Lovaia epulu*, which means “Lovaia language”. Almeida (1976:343) acknowledges Lovaia to be an alternative name for Porlamano and analyses the latter name as a combination

---

11 Our Makuva database does not contain the word *maho*, but the fact that *Me’ehara maho* is never attested as *Me’ehara maho ratu*, but incidentally as *Me’ehara Ratu*, suggests that Makuva *maho* means the same as the Fataluku *ratu* ‘clan’, which in its own is again derived from the proto-Austronesian *datuk* ‘sovereign’.

12 Interestingly, Thomas Matulessy’s revolt took place in 1817. My informant of *Me’ehara maho* rather located the origins of his Central Malukan ancestry in the 16th Century AD.

13 He refused, however, to explain the name of his clan, which is not in Fataluku either.

14 Taking into account the epitomising function of names, it is very well conceivable that *Leti Mecenu Ratu* ‘At Leti Clan’ is just another name for the *Tana Ratu* that also has an acknowledged Leti origin.

15 The *Dalïòra* quarters in Luhuleli on the East coast of nearby Leti Island was explained to us meaning ‘seaside Dai’ versus its counterpart on the other side of the island, *Daivïarta* ‘West Dai’, in which Dai refers to a small island further East in the Babar Archipelago (Engelenhoven 2004).
of lo ‘civet cat’ and a phytonym *vaia*.

In the same article, Almeida mentions Pitileti as the other dwelling place of the Makuva people. According to Hajek, Himmelman and Bowden (2003:162), Porlamano oral traditions confirm that Pitileti was the original location of Lovaia. Table two below lists all calculations about Makuva people/speakers in the literature, which are all centered around Porlamano in Mehara *suku*. The one speaker found in Hull and Branco (2003) in Tutuala hamlet originally fled from Porlamano during the unrest of the Indonesian occupation in 1999.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount of people/speakers</th>
<th>Recorded location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferreira (1951b)</td>
<td>± 100 people</td>
<td><em>Porlamano</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Almeida (1976)</td>
<td>2 villages</td>
<td><em>Porlamano, Pitileti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.E. Almeida (1982)</td>
<td>2 villages, 500 people</td>
<td><em>Porlamano, Pitileti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudhiarta et al. (1994)</td>
<td>extinct</td>
<td><em>Porlamano</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudana et al. (1996)</td>
<td>7 speakers</td>
<td><em>Mehara</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Himmelmann and Hajek (2001)</td>
<td>5 – 8 speakers</td>
<td><em>Porlamano</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajek et al. (2003)</td>
<td>3 speakers</td>
<td><em>Porlamano</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hull and Branco (2003)</td>
<td>1 speaker</td>
<td><em>Tutuala hamlet</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentim et al. (2003)</td>
<td>nearly extinct</td>
<td><em>Lovaia, Huluveru</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takahashi (2004)</td>
<td>3 speakers</td>
<td><em>Loikere, Porlamano</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engelenhoven (2010)</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Makuva speakers in the literature

Previous research has focused on Porlamano, probably it was first mentioned in the literature as a place where Makuvas lived. An important observation to make here is that the Porlamano population is still considered as being ‘different’ or ‘awkward’ and as such are psychologically and sociologically isolated from the other people in the region. From a purely physical anthropological point of view this isolation was confirmed by the research conducted by Maria Emília Almeida (1982:148) who observed that:

“...the values of their genetic frequencies (ABO system) being so different from the Fatalukus from a serological perspective can only be explained by the isolation and the [small] size of the group and the subsequent phenomena of genetic evolution.”

If Almeida’s observation was correct and Pitileti was a Makuva dwelling place, then the cultural ‘aberrancy’ of the Makuvas reported in Fataluku folklore is confirmed too by archeological research. Lape (2006) informs that Pitileti never has been walled in or has been a stronghold. McWilliam (2006, 2007b) and Pannell (2004), among others, however, elaborate that the (Fataluku-speaking) clans in the region originally lived in fortified dwellings.

According to *Tutuala Ratu*, their ancestor created the ancestors of the Makuvas:

---

16 Since *vaia* actually means ‘juice’ in Fataluku, *Lovaia* may indeed be a plant name.

17 No information is provided about the location of Huluveru in Lautem District.

18 During fieldwork in 2003, it was easier for me to go to Loikere, a few hundred metres down the road, or to Tutuala, two kilometres up the road beyond Porlamano. In January 2008, a comparable problem arose at the Portuguese mission of the Doctors of the World when a visit to Porlamano had to be cancelled because none of the Fataluku nurses wanted to go there.
“Over there, God summoned the man (the ancestor of Tutuala Ratu, AvE) to get dirt and mould it into seven puppets. After he had done that God gave the puppets the breath of life. They became people and began to live and talk. These people began to speak Makuva.” Silva and Valentim Cailoru (2004)

Hajek, Himmelmann and Bowden (2003) observe that the term Lovaia is preferred over Makuva by its speakers. In a personal communication in January 2007, Mr. Albino da Silva, who is a member of Tutuala Ratu himself, explained that the ethnonym Makuva in fact is an old Fataluku word meaning “idiot”. This term was used by visiting Fatalukus from the West who could not understand the language of the people in Tutuala subdistrict. Being speakers of fata lukunu (“the correct¹⁹ speech”), not understanding a language simply meant that that language was ‘not correct’ and as such not a true language at all. This is also clearly verbalised by Valentim Cailoru, Goveia and Moriti:

“[A]ccording to the information of these three people ... this language is very ancient. It seems true to me, because it is very primitive.” (Valentim Cailoru, Goveia and Moriti 2003)

Interestingly, Almeida (1967) reports that the territory of the cave sites where he conducted fieldwork in the northeastern coastal part of Tutuala subdistrict were considered by his indigenous assistants to be formerly occupied by Makuvas. Later (1976:38), he quotes Ruy Cinatti who found that part of the studied Lene Hara cave (South of Pitileti) belonged to the clan of Jen i La’i Ratu. Indeed, fieldwork undertaken in 2006 revealed that leading members of Jen i La’i Ratu in Ioru hamlet were able to produce small sentences in Makuva. However, I only overheard longer stretches of Makuva text in a ritual at Valu beach (Wayenburg 2007). A year later, an informant of Cailoru Ratu in Tutuala hamlet explained that in the 60-ies of the previous century he was still speaking fluently in Makuva with his grandmother, but that he forgot about the language after his family and surroundings shifted to Fataluku. In a personal communication, Mr. Justino Valentim Cailoru confirmed that according to custom the secretive burial rituals among Cailoru Ratu are still conducted in Makuva. However, taking into account that Makuva actually means “idiot”, it does not come as a surprise that the informants above who are members of leading clans in the region prefer not to use this specific name for their ritual language.

Hull and Branco (2003) and Hajek, Himmelmann and Bowden (2003) inform that the Portuguese colonial administration directly after the Second World War started to improve the infrastructure of Tutuala subdistrict by constructing a road through the region that connected the capital Lospalos to Valu beach. The respective clan populations that were scattered throughout the subdistrict were relocated in villages along the road. The people originally living in the Veru valley moved to the Veru and Ioru hamlets, whereas those living near the western shores of the Iralalaru lake were placed in Poros. The people from the former Haro settlement moved to Pitileti near the road from Tutuala village to Valu beach (Lape 2006:291), whereas the population from present-day Cailoru came from several Cailoru Ratu settlements in the region. As such, the hamlets of Porlamano and Loikere were also moved to their present day location where both hamlets together are usually referred to as Mehara village.

¹⁹ There is some disagreement about the term fata. Nacher (2012:158) lists it in his dictionary as certo ‘certain’. Elsewhere I translated it as ‘correct’. Paulino 2012 points out that ‘speaking correctly’ translates in Fataluku rather as em masu ca’a (take right say) and prefers the translation ‘simple speech’, conform the translation of fata ‘plain’ in the Fataluku.org wordlist. The philosophy behind fata luku (plain speak) indeed is to talk straightforwardly.
According to Hull and Branco (2003), which is confirmed by Southwest Malukan folklore, Loikere used to be located on the Northshore. Although they also locate Porlamano somewhere in the North, the identification of Pitileti as Porlamano suggests that the latter may have been located somewhere in the southern parts of Mehara suku. Fact is, that both hamlets were lifted from their isolation after their relocation and that the ‘demise’ of the Makuva seems connected with that.

4. Grammatical outline of Makuva
This section extensively quotes from Engelenhoven and Valentim Cailoru (2006) and is subdivided in three subparagraphs, phonotactics and phonology (4.1), noun phrases (4.2) and clause structure (4.3).

4.1 Phonotactics and phonology
Makuva has 15 consonants that can be divided in a labial, dental, alveolar, palatal, velar and glottal set: /p, b, m, f, ʃ, t, n, s, z, d, c, ʒ, j, k, h/.

Capell’s (1972) observation that Makuva seems to lack voiced occlusives like Fataluku is contradicted by the presence of a voiced bilabial [b] and alveolar [d]. However, the voiced bilabial occlusive was attested only in a few words like [ʔajblạhe], which Capell lists as aiboleva ‘wood’ and Hull and Branco (2003) as ai bloheva meaning either ‘wood’ or ‘pillow’. Whereas it is true that the most Fataluku dialects lack an alveolar occlusive, it must be said here that the palatal occlusive [c] in the East, Central and Lorehe dialects corresponds with a retroflex occlusive [ɖ] in the Northwest dialect and the closely related Oirata language on Kisar Island, and with an alveolar [d] in the surrounding isolects. This is exemplified in (1) by the loan kuda ‘horse’ from local Malay, which itself is an Austronesian language. Its alveolar occlusive survived in all Austronesian languages, except Meher where it shifted to a voiced retroflex as in the Fataluku Northwest dialect.

(1) Waima’a  Makasai  Fataluku  Oirata  Meher  Makuva  Leti
kuda  kuca  kuḍa  kuḍa  kuda  kuda

Makuva and Fataluku are the only languages in the region to have a voiceless palatal occlusive [c]. The absence of a palatal and of a velar nasal in Makuva agrees with the inventories in the surrounding Austronesian and non-Austronesian languages (Hull 2004b). Hull (1998) explains this feature of all so-called Austronesian ‘A Group’ languages as a merger into a dental nasal of the PMP velar nasal and the Proto Timoric dental nasal, which itself already derived from an earlier merger of the PMP dental and palatal nasals. Van Engelenhoven (1995) describes a similar merger for the Southwest Malukan languages.

Makuva shares with all Fataluku dialects the allophonic variation between the palatal glide, the voiced palatal fricative and the voiced dental sibilant: [j~ʒ~z]. Whereas in Fataluku mainly attested between vowels, e.g. [taja, ʈaʃa, taza] ‘to sleep’, in Makuva this allophony is also attested in initial position, e.g. [zenʃa, ʒenʃa, zenʃa] ‘fish’. This feature sets off Makuva as a Timorese language from the neighboring languages in Southwest Maluku that do not have palatal fricatives or voiced sibilants. Similarly, the nearby Luangic-Kisaric languages in Southwest Maluku do not have the bilabial voiceless fricative [f], which occurs in the inventories of both language phyla on Timor.

---

20 The box contains the non-Austronesian languages.
21 The languages of Wetar on the border of Southwest Maluku and Nusa Tenggara Timur do have [f] but belong to a different subgroup within the A Group of Timoric languages (Hull 1998).
Although the glottal stop occurs in both phyla and both regions, no clear examples have been found in Makuva. The only examples attested were [lo/o] or [lo/u] 'leg', the demonstrative marker [ne?e] and on the morpheme boundary between vowel-initial verbs that are inflected with a pronominal prefix, e.g. [na?alraj] ‘he reads’ where na- is ‘3sg’. In the East dialect of Fataluku, the glottal stop is effaced, e.g. [ma/u] versus Central Dialect [ma?u] ‘come’.

Makuva has 6 vowels: /i, u, e, o, a/. Whereas the high and low vowels are straightforward, the articulation of the mid vowels vary between [e,e] and [o,o], respectively. In Luangic-Kisaric these vowels are mainly confined to the penultimate syllable. Their height depends on the height of the vowel in the ultimate syllable (e.g. Meher: /leli/ [leli] ‘ivory’ versus /lela/[lela] ‘spirit’. In Leti, the open allophones are developing into different phonemes (Van Engelenhoven 2004:59-61). Although higher and lower variants of the mid vowels are also attested in the Central and Lorehe dialects of Fataluku (e.g. Campagnolo 1972), further research is required to determine whether these are allophones of a single front-mid or back-mid vowel phoneme or not. Elicitation sessions with informants suggest that in the Mehara variant final high back vowels are lowered to mid position, e.g. /vera/ [âra, âere, âere].

Elicitation from informants suggests that Makuva does not have a special set of long vowels, which does occur in the neighboring languages. Campagnolo (1972) points at long vowels in monosyllabic morphemes in Fataluku, of which ongoing research suggests that their length is imposed by bimoraic feet (Stoel 2006). Christensen and Christensen (1992) also report a few monosyllabic morphemes having long in Meher, e.g. ne: ‘snake’ (< PMP *nipay). Leti, on the other hand, has a special set of long vowels that evolved from a *V/V or VpV sequence where the glottal stop and the voiceless bilabial occlusive were effaced (Van Engelenhoven 2004).

Hull and Branco (2003) analyzed Makuva as an Austronesian language that originated from Southwest Maluku. Their main indication was the apparent shift of PMP *t to k, which is typical for Meher on Kisar Island. This is exemplified in he boxed word ‘stone’ in (2). Left of Makuva is Waima’a, which is its closest Austronesian relative on Timor (Baukau District); to its right are its Luangic-Kisaric neighbors in Southwest Maluku.

---

22 [lo?u] may very well be analysed as lo ‘leg’ + a possessive suffix -?u ‘1sg’.
23 This may very well be a Tetum loan: ne’e. It has attested only once in Valentim’s recording of the late Sr. Almeida, whose speech also contained phrases in Portuguese and Fataluku.
24 Hull (2002, 2005) points at an assymetry in the articulation of mid vowels in Waimaha and Makasai: [e] and [i] instead of [o].
Later, Hull (2004a) re-categorized Makuva rather as a typical Timor language. This is exemplified by the words ‘rain’ and ‘road’ directly under the box where it can be seen that Makuva, like for example its fellow-Austronesian neighbor Waima’a, has separate reflexes for *z (e.g. ‘road’ *zalan > + jalan > jala > janɛ) and *t (e.g. ‘sea’ *tasik > kahi), whereas both proto-phonemes merged in Luangic-Kisaric. The last two words, ‘dog’ and ‘sea’, display a sound shift that is exclusive for Makuva on Timor: *s > t. In Southwest Maluku it has only been attested in Southeast Babar in the Babar archipelago (Engelenhoven, 2009).

Another feature in Makuva, which may point at intensive linguistic contact between the tip of East Timor and Southwest Maluku, is the phenomenon of metathesis. Hull and Branco (2003) point out that this is a common feature in Austronesian languages of Timor. However, metathesis in Makuva occurs between originally final consonants and preceding vowels. This is displayed in (3).

(3) GLOSS Makuva Meher Leti

| ‘swollen’ pekna pekɛnɛ petna |
| ‘order’ topna topɔnɔ sopna |
| ‘kitchen’ dapru dاضرurururut |
| ‘heavy’ herka werkɛ ppɛrta |
| ‘vein’ urkɛ oɾkɔ–nɛ urta |

This type of metathesis occurs exclusively in Southwest Maluku. The boxed word ‘kitchen’, which is loaned from Malay dapur, shows that in Leti and Makuva the final consonant /r/ metathesizes with the preceding vowel /u/. Interestingly, Meher is the only Luangic-Kisaric language where metathesis does not permeate the entire lexicon. Albeit that some words, like ‘brain’ in (2) above do feature metathesis, specifically in the Northern dialect (Samloy et al. 1998:10) - an echo vowel is added to the final consonant, as in ‘kitchen’ in (3). However, whereas in Southwest Maluku metathesis is a grammatical device (Engelenhoven 2003, 2004), in Makuva it is petrified in the lexicon.

An exclusive feature in Makuva is the geminating of intervocalic consonants. Also initial occlusives may occur geminated when followed by a liquid. Further research is required to

---

25 The Leti words for ‘sea’ in (2) is an adapted Malay loan tasik.
identify the exact rules of this phenomenon. In a few instances, previous researchers report clusters of different consonants where we found a geminate, as for example the word for ‘hear’ in the box below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Enclitic</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'moon'</td>
<td>hunE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'pig'</td>
<td>hake</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'hear'</td>
<td>tetE</td>
<td></td>
<td>depta (Sudana et al 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'mat'</td>
<td>tetre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'maize'</td>
<td>beta:rai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Noun phrases
4.2.1 Nominal enclitics and suffixes
Whereas all surrounding languages mark plurality, we have found no indications of it in Makuva. Would Makuva align with the Southwest Malukan typological frame, then the presence of a cardinal numeral or its function as a subject would block plural marking (Engelenhoven 2004). Hull (2005), on the other hand, specifically mentions that in the Central Fataluku dialect human NPs may mark plurality on the cardinal numeral:

(5) pala-ocava utu’-ateru
    garden-lord three-PL
    ‘three farmers’ (Fataluku)

The =va enclitic was Capell’s (1972) main indication to categorize Makuva as a ‘non-Austronesian’ language, because he analyzed it as a nominal category marker reminiscent of what is found in Papuan languages in North Halmahera (North Maluku). Hull and Branco (2003) link the =va enclitic to the generic nominal suffix –f in Dawan (e.g. Lake 2002), suggesting that /va/ has an allomorph /ve/. Although we acknowledge a segment –ve that occurs usually on nouns, it's co-occurrence with =va indicates that –ve is a morphological marker rather than a syntactic marker. Another morpheme, which Capell (1972) mentions but remains undiscussed in Hull and Branco (2003) is –ke. Again, its co-occurrence with =va suggests that the first mentioned is functionally different the latter. For the time being the function of these suffixes remains unclear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Enclitic</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mahek-ve=va</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ler-ve=va</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘sun’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ar-ke=va</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘man’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pip-ke=va</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘goat’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our field work yielded a blurred picture with respect to possessive constructions. Like all other languages in the region, Makuva conforms to the so-called ‘Brandes-line’ region where possessor nouns precede possession nouns. Although our informants we very hesitant, two patterns emerged from the elicitations that suggest Makuva had an alienable-inalienable distinction as has been found in Meher. Inalienable nouns are marked for possession by means of a pronominal suffix on the possession noun, whereas alienable possession nouns prepose the possessor noun or precliticize a possessor pronoun. In (7) below Makuva is compared with

---

26 We have attested that stress may shift from the penultimate syllable to the ultimate when encliticised with the NP marker -va, e.g. háke ⇒ hakéba ⇒ háke:ba.
Meher and Southeast Babar in the Babar archipelago, where it can be seen that the latter does not mark (in)alienability. In Meher alienable nouns have a particular preposed particle on which he possessive suffix is docked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inalienable noun: hand</th>
<th>Makuva</th>
<th>Meher</th>
<th>SE Babar</th>
<th>Fataluku</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my hand</td>
<td>lipo=va</td>
<td>Lima-n²⁷</td>
<td>lim ‘-ol</td>
<td>a tana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your (sg) hand</td>
<td>lipo-‘oni</td>
<td>Lima-u</td>
<td>lim m-ol</td>
<td>e tana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his hand</td>
<td>lipo-n=oni</td>
<td>lima-n</td>
<td>lim l-ol</td>
<td>i tana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our (incl.) hand</td>
<td>ik’ lipo-n=oni</td>
<td>lima-d</td>
<td>lim k-ol</td>
<td>afi tana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our (exc.) hand</td>
<td>am’ lipo-n=oni</td>
<td>lima-m</td>
<td>lim m-ol</td>
<td>ini tana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your (pl) hand</td>
<td>em’ lipo-n=oni</td>
<td>lima-m</td>
<td>lim m-ol</td>
<td>i tana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their hand</td>
<td>tir’ lipo-n=oni</td>
<td>lima-r</td>
<td>lim t-ol</td>
<td>tavar i tana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alienable noun: house</th>
<th>lakke=va</th>
<th>nakara</th>
<th>em</th>
<th>le</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>my house</td>
<td>au lakke=va</td>
<td>ai nu-‘u nakara</td>
<td>em ‘-ol</td>
<td>a le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your (sg) house</td>
<td>o lakke=va</td>
<td>o nu-m nakara</td>
<td>em m-ol</td>
<td>e le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his house</td>
<td>ar’ lakke=va</td>
<td>ai ni-n nakara</td>
<td>em l-ol</td>
<td>i le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our (incl.) house</td>
<td>ik’ lakke=va</td>
<td>ik ni-k nakara</td>
<td>em k-ol</td>
<td>afi le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>our (exc.) house</td>
<td>am’ lakke=va</td>
<td>ai ni-m nakara</td>
<td>em m-ol</td>
<td>ini le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>your (pl) house</td>
<td>em’ lakke=va</td>
<td>mi ni-m nakara</td>
<td>em m-ol</td>
<td>i le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their house</td>
<td>tir’ lakke=va</td>
<td>hi rir nakara</td>
<td>em t-ol</td>
<td>tavar i le</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interesting phenomenon in Makuva is the –seemingly obligatory- addition of the demonstrative pronoun oni when the noun has a pronominal suffix. Observe that in this specific case the final vowel /e/ changes to /o/, suggesting some kind of vowel harmony between final vowels of noun with pronominal suffixes and demonstratives. This feature equals the Southeast Babar possessive construction where the pronominal suffix docks as an onset on a subsequent possessive particle (Steinhauer and Van Engelenhoven 2006).²⁹ In the box in (7) above it can be seen that our Makuva informants use the same suffix from 3sg through 3pl. Also in Leti, the 3sg suffix is used for all plural possessors, except 2pl. However, like the other Luangic languages Leti does not distinguish alienable from inalienable possession. In another Austronesian language of Southwest Maluku, Serua, the inalienable possession construction featuring pronominal on the noun is being replaced by the alienable possession construction. In this construction that equals the Meher one having preposed particles to which pronominal suffixes are added, the 3sg suffix occurs with all plural possessors except 1plex. Van Engelenhoven (2003) suggests this grammatical simplification to be induced by the recent imposed migration history of the Seruans. This is also a plausible scenario for the Makuvans who were replaced in villages near the road connecting Tutuala to Lospalos.

²⁷ In Meher inalienable nouns are always suffixed.
²⁸ or /a/.
²⁹ In fact, the particle is a syllable on which the onset consonant is functionally a possessive suffix of the noun, whereas the coda consonant is a pronominal suffix encoding singularity/plurality, e.g. em l-o-t (house 3sg-PART-3sg) ‘his house’ versus em l-o-t (house 3sg-PART-3pl) ‘his houses’.
4.2.2 word order
Like all languages in the region, Makuva has head-initial phrases. Attributes are directly placed right from the head, which can be followed by numerals and/or determiners like demonstratives:

(8) \[ \text{HEAD} \pm \text{ATTRIBUTE} / \text{NUMERAL} \pm \text{DETERMINER} \]

Makuva NP

Ongoing research suggests Makuva has a large class of adjectives that prototypically fill the attribute slot. In this aspect Makuva differs from both ‘non-Austronesian’ and Austronesian languages that surround it. Whereas the Luangic-Kisaric languages have a small closed class of adjectives—e.g. in Leti the set of adjectives contains only seven items - the ‘non-Austronesian’, e.g. Fataluku, ones does not distinguish formally between adjectives and verbs. Example (9a) and (b) show that the demonstrative eni or oni\(^{30}\) deletes final vowels from attributes. Ongoing research is required to determine its phonological rules.

(9a) nurke lapeni
(9b) sapateni
nurke lapa=eni
book big=DEM
this big book

EXAMPLE (9) shows that the demonstrative eni or oni\(^{30}\) deletes final vowels from attributes. Ongoing research is required to determine its phonological rules.

\[ \text{Minve ‘delicious’ in (10a) shows that adjectives can function predicatively. In Luangic-Kisaric, however, predicatively used adjectives require a subject-agreement marker. This is displayed in the Leti example in (10b).} \]

(10a) Jene pateva minve mia.
jene pate=va minve mia
fish small=va delicious PERF
‘Small fish are delicious.’

(10b) Ianmikmikri nmuti.
iina=miki-mikri n-muti
fish=RED-delicious 3sg-white.
‘A delicious fish is white.’ (Leti)

In the surrounding languages numerals directly follow the attribute slot. However, we have not been able to elicit such combinations from our informants. Also no examples were found in the material of previous researchers. Example (10a) above shows that the NP marker =va attaches directly to adjectives. There was, however, no consensus among informants whether it also combines with numerals. Our Loikere informant provided example (11a) where =va is added to the noun ‘pig’, whereas our Porlamano informant provided examples like (11b) where =va was consistently removed in combination with numerals. Nobody added =va to the numeral.

---

\(^{30}\) According to Hull and Branco (2003) oni is the Tutuala counterpart of Mehara eni. We have indeed not been able to distinguish a semantic difference between both forms.
The structure as displayed in (11b) is consistent with the ones in the surrounding languages. However, Steinhauer (2008) points out that cardinal numerals in his three sample languages\(^{31}\), unlike other phrase constituents, do not metathesize on to the preceding phrase constituent, suggesting an exclusive syntactic status for these numerals in NPs. (11a) could be a Makuva confirmation of this hypothesis.

4.3 clause structure
4.3.1 verbal affixes
Himmelmann’s and Hajek’s (2001) and Hajek’s, Himmelmann’s and Bowden’s (2003) conclusion that Makuva be closely related to the Austronesian languages of Southwest Maluku was mainly based on the fact that verbs are inflected with a pronominal subject agreement prefix. This is a feature that is lacking in all surrounding languages on Timor, whether they are Austronesian or not. Whereas the Luangic-Kisaric languages distinguish at least two verb classes with formally different inflections\(^{32}\), Makuva only has one type of inflection. Fataluku loans, however, are usually not inflected.\(^{33}\) This is exemplified in (12) where the pronominal subjects are simply preposed to the Fataluku loan. No instances have been found of free pronominal subjects with pronominal subject markers, suggesting that Makuva has a rule similar to Leti and Meher where only lexical subjects may co-occur with pronominal prefixes on verbs.

(12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘to bathe’</th>
<th>‘to disappear’ (&lt; Fataluku)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>ruto</td>
<td>mula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>vo-ruto</td>
<td>a’ mula (au + mula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>mo-ruto</td>
<td>o mula (o + mula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>na-ruto</td>
<td>ar’ mula (ari + mula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1plinc</td>
<td>ka-ruto</td>
<td>ik’ mula (ika + mula)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1plex</td>
<td>ma-ruto</td>
<td>ami mula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>me-ruto</td>
<td>emi mula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>ra-ruto</td>
<td>tira mula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Makuva diverts from Southwest Malukan languages like Leti and Serua in that it does not inflect verbs for second person in imperatives (e.g. examples (16a) and (b) in the next paragraph). Subject agreement is no longer productive in Makuva. In elicited sentences, therefore, the conjugated verb did hardly ever agree with the subject, which is explicitly salient in the material of Sudana et al. (1996). This same phenomenon was attested also in the Serua language (Engelenhoven 2003) and the ‘Sung Language’ (Engelenhoven 2004), albeit that the latter rather is a register within the Leti language. This is exemplified in (13) where the verb has a 1plinc marker while the subject is a third person singular.

(13) Pak Guru ka-kakra.
     Mr. school teacher (Ind) 1plinc-talk
     ‘The school teacher talks.’ (Sudana et al. 1996:83)

\(^{31}\) Helong and Dawan in West Timor and Leti in Southwest Maluku.

\(^{32}\) No inflection or consonant prefixation in Meher, full, ‘metathesised’ and irregular inflection in Leti.

\(^{33}\) A noticeable exception is ‘to read’ elre or alra (< Fataluku eler-e ‘read-VRB’ < Portuguese ler), which has been attested with a 3sg prefix: na-ael-ai ‘3sg-read-TR’.
An exclusive element in Makuva that has not been attested anywhere in the surrounding languages is a vocalic suffix ending in /i#/ that we will preliminarily label ‘transitive suffix’, having at least two allomorphs {ai} and {oi}. Ongoing research suggests {oi} to be the allomorph used on verbs with /u/. However, they may also be dialectal variants.  

This is exemplified in (14).

(14)

| ‘to look after’ | tomra | ➔ | tomrai |
| ‘to cut’ | keri | ➔ | kerikai |
| ‘to buy’ | heli | ➔ | helikai |
| ‘to call’ | ho | ➔ | ho’ai, hovai |
| ‘to kick’ | kumu | ➔ | kumoi |
| ‘to search’ | sapu | ➔ | sapoi |

4.2.2 word order
The Lautem- Southwef Maluku region features two word orders that are usually linked to the genetic origin of the language. All Austronesian languages in the region feature a verb medial or ‘SVO’ order, whereas the so-called ‘non-Austronesian’ ones have a verb final or ‘SOV’ order (Klamer 2002). The Austronesian character of the Makuva lexicon (Hull and Branco 2003) suggests therefore that the language be verb medial. This is indeed what is displayed in most sentences of the Makuva version of the *Conversa de um médico e um doente ‘Conversation Between a Doctor and a Patient’,* a text prepared by the Portuguese anthropologist António de Almeida.  

(15)  

Ou ulomu apitnona oco moruto vaucomonu meta.  
O ulomu apitnona oko morut’ vaukumoni meta  
2sg head-2sgP ill=IMPER VET 2sg-bathe forehead-2sgP=DEM only  
‘Just do not wash your forehead when your head aches.’ (Conversa 60)  

In (15) above we see in the box that the object ‘your forehead’ follows the verb ‘you wash’. We have found one instance where a verb final construction is used (16a). (16b), which is also a command, shows the expected verb medial word order.

(16a) Toko moni momahe. (16b) Kon tai lipo moni.  
Tokumoni momahe. Kontai lipomoni  
toka-μu=oni mo-mahe konta-ai lipa-μu=oni  
mouth-2sgP=DEM 2sg-open lift-TR hand-2sgP=DEM  
‘Open your mouth.’ (Conversa 28) ‘Lift your hand.’ (Conversa 30)  

Our field work signals that more and more Makuva word order aligns with the SOV order of Fataluku in sentences that specify direction, which in Fataluku are encoded by means of an

---

34 In fact, {oi} was never attested in our own field work but only in Sudana et. al. 1996.  
35 A typed and recorded version of this text was found in the Anthropobiological Centre in Lisbon and subsequently lodged at ELAR in London. Example sentences from this text have five lines: the first line is the original transcription; the second line contains what is said on the recording; the third line provides the morphological analysis of the second line, while the fourth and fifth lines contain glosses and the translation of the recording. If necesssary, a sixth line is added for original Portuguese translation when it differs from our translation.
adposed clause. This is exemplified in (17a) where the object precedes the verb. (17b) provides the Fataluku counterpart.

(17a) \textbf{Tapoi muti mai} vei lakeni.
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{tapoi$^{36}$} muti mai vei lake=eni. \\
\text{broom take come DIR house=DEM} \\
\text{‘Take a broom to the house.’} \\
\end{tabular}

(17b) \textbf{Lulur em la’a le ma’u.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{broom take DIR house come} \\
\text{‘Take a broom to the house.’ (Fataluku)} \\
\end{tabular}

The sentences above show that Makuva, unlike Fataluku, combines motion verbs with direction verbs (underlined in the examples above) in a series, which is a phenomenon it shares with the other Austronesian languages in the region. Similarly, Makuva also seems to lack a special morpheme to indicate ablative motion. However, whereas the other languages require a locational verb (‘to be somewhere’, e.g. 18b), Makuva simply encodes the location as an object of a direction verb (18a).

(18a) \textbf{Thomas Kikuola nala mai mia.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{Thomas Tutuala na-laha mai mia} \\
\text{Thomas Tutuala 3sg-go come PERF} \\
\text{‘Thomas came from Tutuala.’} \\
\end{tabular}

(18b) \textbf{Thomas Tutuala na’en hai ma’u.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{Thomas Tutuala na’-e=nu hai ma’u} \\
\text{Thomas Tutuala LOC-VRB=and PERF come} \\
\text{‘Thomas came from Tutuala.’ (Fataluku)} \\
\end{tabular}

In Southwest Malukan languages a comitative notion is usually indicated by means of a verb meaning ‘to be with’, which clause is juxtaposed to another clause specifying the action of the scene:

(19) \textbf{Aüòra püatdidi masaammèke.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{a$^{\text{1sg}}$-òra püata=dí^di ma-saava=mèka=e} \\
\text{S$^{1}$sg-with woman=DEM^END 1plex-married-only=DEX} \\
\text{‘I just marry this woman here.’ (Leti, Engelenhoven 2004:254)} \\
\end{tabular}

Makuva encodes comitative relations by means of a morpheme nora ‘with’, which we suppose to have been loaned from either Meher or Leti (< n-òra ‘3sg-with’). Makuva follows the Lautem-Southwest Maluku pattern in which the comitative segment precedes the segment where the verbal action is specified.

(20a) \textbf{Norai hakkeu en’pan’ ratilu.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
\text{nora-ai hak-ke-u eni=pana ra-tilu} \\
\text{with=TR pig-ke-1sgP DEM=SEQ 3pl-fight} \\
\text{‘They fight with my pig.’} \\
\end{tabular}

\text{\textsuperscript{36} Actually this is a verb sapu (< Indonesian sapu) +transitive suffix oi.}
\text{\textsuperscript{37} A notable exception is Meher, which is the only Southwest Malukan language having an ablative verb, e.g. Ya ‘-anoo Amerika (1sg 1sg-from America) ‘I come from America.’ (Christensen et al. 1991: 10).}
The transitive suffix in example (20a) above confirms the verbal character of nora. However, it is not always used as is exemplified in (20b) where the informant used nora in order to translate the Fataluku nere ‘to accompany, follow’ (cf. (20c)).

(20b)  
Atova nora ar’ mamorkeni.  
at=ova nora ari ma-mori-ke=eni  
dog=va with man REL-live-ke=DEM  
‘The dog accompanies his boss.’

Ipar ocava nere.  
dog boss follow  
‘The dog accompanies his boss.’ (Fataluku)

As already mentioned in 4.2, Makuva shares the ‘possessor-possession’ construction that features all languages in the region. The Austronesian languages in the region use this construction too to encode locational notions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(21)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Waima’a</th>
<th>Makuva</th>
<th>Leti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>on (= ‘top’)</td>
<td>wuu</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>vavna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under (= ‘underside’)</td>
<td>wake</td>
<td>vika</td>
<td>naani</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in front (= ‘face’)</td>
<td>wase</td>
<td>vauku</td>
<td>liu-ne (‘face-POS’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behind (= ‘back’)</td>
<td>tuko</td>
<td>liuru</td>
<td>tukra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>next to (= ‘side’)</td>
<td>bali</td>
<td>servìali</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in (=inside’)</td>
<td>lale</td>
<td>larane</td>
<td>riarma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out (= ‘outside’)</td>
<td>igi</td>
<td>teri</td>
<td>plòr-ne (‘seaside-POS’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas we were able to elicit some of these ‘locational nouns’ (Engelenhoven 2004:117) from our informants, they never used them in sentences. Ongoing research suggests that in Fataluku and Oirata (on Kisar Island) locational notions are encoded through verbs rather than nouns. The only clear example of a locational noun in Fataluku is fanu ‘face’ that is used to encode the notion ‘in front of’. Elicitation from informants for the notion ‘on (top of)’ in general yielded a form like me-n-hitu (2pl-n-upward) 40, which is a verb. Example (17a) above shows that Makuva specifies the direction of the motion (muti ‘take’) by means of a second verb (mai ‘come’). This is again displayed in (22a) where hitu ‘upward’ is added to the verb kuru to sit’.

(22a)  
Nakurhito aruva.  
na-kuru=hito aru=va  
3sg-sit=upward boat=va  
‘He steps into the boat.’

(22b)  
Loiasu hi’apen imire.  
loiasu hi’a=pe=nu i=mire  
boat upward=move=and 3sg-sit  
‘He steps into the boat.’ (Fataluku)

In Fataluku this scene is encoded by means of a clause combination in which the first clause profiles the movement and the second clause the resulting state. Luangic-Kisaric uses both strategies. Unlike Makuva, however, none of the latter can encode ‘upward motion’ as an

---

38 The informant who gave this form actually translated it with the Fataluku fanu ‘front, face’ for which others came up with vauku. Since it is clearly related to PMP *liuR ‘back’ (e.g.Leti liiru)
39 The notion ‘aside’ was consistently translated as either vanne ‘right’ or vene ‘left’.
40 We do not know what the segment /n/ means. It may very well be an old prefix, comparable to /n/ in vo-n-kako (1sg-n-afraid) ‘I am afraid’.
41 One informant insisted (22a) meant api me (Fataluku: ‘fish take’) ‘to fish’.
adverb on to the verb. The notion of ‘aside’, which turned out to be very difficult for the informants, was equally readily encoded by means of a second verb:

(23)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mamrik’} & \quad \text{lutrai} & \quad \text{eni.} \\
\text{ma-mrike} & \quad \text{lutra-ai} & \quad \text{eni} \\
\text{1plex-stand} & \quad \text{follow-TR} & \quad \text{DEM}
\end{align*}
\]
‘We stand next to him.’

5.0 Final remarks and conclusion.
5.1 Grammar
Engelenhoven (2009) has convincingly proven that Makuva lexicon is basically Austronesian, notwithstanding awkward sound changes like PMP *t > k and PMP *s > t that initially blur the Austronesian character of its lexicon. The occurrence of consonant-vowel metathesis in historically closed final syllables may be explained through a scenario of contact with Southwest Malukan languages where this feature is quite common, but synchronic feature. However, whereas subject-agreement is confined to verbs of Austronesian origin, metathesis has also been attested on Fataluku loans, for example *neklu ‘angry’ (< Fataluku *nekul-e ‘angry-VRB’) and

However, there are many indications that Makuva in general follows the Timorense Sprachbund. Like all Timorense languages clauses are negated in Makuva by means of a negator preceding the verb. The notion ‘not yet’ is encoded by means of combining the negator with an imperfective marker\textsuperscript{42} ona, which is placed before the verb. Like Fataluku, Makuva distinguishes ‘no’ in one-word sentences/replies from a preverbal one. However, whereas the Fataluku form categorizes as a verb (‘it is not so’), Makuva adds either =va to the independently used negator or =ta when it is used preverbally. Southwest Malukan languages rather add an imperfect marker after the verb or in the end of the clause. Whereas Waima’a on Timor uses a formally different negator with nominal predicates and Leti inverts the order and places the negator in predicate final position, Fataluku does not distinguish between verbal and nominal predicates. We have not been able to elicit negated nominal clauses from our informants. Neither have we been able to attest whether Makuva has a special negating verb meaning ‘to exist not’, which is found in Waima’a and Fataluku\textsuperscript{43}, but in none of the Luangic-Kisaric languages.

(24)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GLOSS</th>
<th>Waima’a</th>
<th>Fataluku</th>
<th>Makuva</th>
<th>Leti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>upe</td>
<td>kava</td>
<td>taa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG-V</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>akam</td>
<td>kat(a)</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG-N</td>
<td>debo</td>
<td>akam</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>N ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not.yet</td>
<td>da-hati</td>
<td>aka -ono</td>
<td>kav-on</td>
<td>ta…maata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not.exist</td>
<td>dihe/mohu</td>
<td>pali</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>(ta lae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VET</td>
<td>aisai</td>
<td>tapa</td>
<td>oko</td>
<td>ïena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another resemblance between Fataluku, Meher and Makuva is the special set of possessive pronouns. Makuva seems to be between the Fataluku system, in which specific possessive pronouns are placed in front of a morpheme hini, henii or hani, and the Meher system, which uses the alienable possession construction of a segment ni to which a pronominal suffix is added and is preceded by a personal pronoun.

\textsuperscript{42} Hull (2001) prefers to refer to it as gressive.

\textsuperscript{43} However, not in any of the Makasai dialects that are spoken in the region between the Waimaha and Fataluku territories.
Makuva clauses display both ‘Austronesian’ SVO and ‘non-Austronesian’ SOV word orders. We hypothesize that SVO is the original word order that is more and more being replaced by the Fataluku pattern. This is especially salient in clauses that contain an adverbial complement referring to a place or a direction.

Although Makuva features subject-agreement on mostly verbs of Austronesian origin, it is not so that it occurs everywhere. Almost all Fataluku loans do not inflect an agreement marker, nor do the Austronesian roots inflect 2sg or 2pl in the imperative mood. The fact that most informants were not able to produce verb paradigms with inflections and the fact that often the pronominal prefix no longer agrees with the subject in elicited sentences equals the situation of language endangerment as Van Engelenhoven (2003) has attested in Serua, one of the northern languages in Southwest Maluku. We hypothesize that the original (S)VO order is closely related to the awareness of subject agreement. This is exemplified in sentence (26a) which has SVO with acknowledged 2sg inflection:

(26a) Moranai halkoni. mo-rana-ai halke=oni
2sg-wait-TR friend=DEM
You wait for your friend.’

When the pronominal prefix is no longer recognized as a subject agreement marker, then the informants copy the Fataluku SOV order (examples 26b and c):

(26b) Paiatani kareta moranai. Paiatani kareta ihire.
Paiatani bus 2sg-wait-TR Paiatani bus wait-VRB
‘Paiatani waits for the bus.’

(26c) Paiatani kareta mo-rana-ai Paiatani kareta ihir-e
Paiatani bus 2sg-wait-TR Paiatani bus wait-VRB
‘Paiatani waits for the bus.’ (Fataluku)

5.2 Makuva: a concealed language

Although the grammatical excursion in paragraph 4 in first instance may suggest a ‘normal’ scenario of language endangerment, and finally death, we are hesitant to compare the Makuva case to other types of language endangerment. The Serua case mentioned above concerns a language, which is truly on the brink of extinction through extreme displacement of its society to the Netherlands and later on to Seram Island in Central Maluku. In both locations, however, they managed to maintain their own identity as a separate ethnic group.

Previous researchers focused on the place where Makuva speakers had been found: Lovaia (Porlamano).44 It is true that after the relocation of this village to Mehara, together with Loikera, speakers were to be found here. However, it is very significant to note that most, if not all (!) researchers had the late Sr. And Sr.a de Almeida as informant. These people were

44 Hull and Branco (2003) had another one, Sr.a Felicidade Correia, who lives in Tutuala, but came from Porlamano originally.
also our main informants. Additionally, we were also helped by the late Sr.a Laulinda da Costa. It needs to be stressed that these three people were members of Me’ehara maho. Its status as the indigenous landowner clan of the territory where Porlamano and Loikere have been rebuilt may very well have been the main reason why his clan functioned as the bridge between the Makuva-speaking ‘inner’ group of Porlamano and the outside world.45

Our knowledge about this language and its speakers depended completely on what the Fataluku-speaking (!) informants wanted to tell and often their information began a life on its in the scientific community. For example, Hajek, Himmelmann and Bowden refer to an alternative Fataluku name for Porlamano, lacoxo coxo malai (Fereirra 1951a:1), and point out that malai ‘appears to be the same as the widespread Timorese term for ‘foreign’ (Hajek, Himmelmann and Bowden 2003:162). In fact, Fereirra’s phrase can better be interpreted as a corruption of the Fataluku le koco-koco malai (house RED-wall.made.of.plant.fibre king) “lord(s) of the houses made of plant material”, which stressed the fact that the Makuvas were unlike the surrounding clans whose lived in fortified places.46

The generally accepted idea as expressed in Sundana et al. (1996) that Makuva be a language without a ‘literary’ tradition proved to be wrong when I witnessed a Jeni i La’i Ratu ritual on Valu beach in 2007 where prayers were recited in Makuva. However, only the ‘chosen’, a small group of specialists knew their meaning. This strengthens our hypothesis that Makuva is a ritual register within the Fataluku speech of the clans in the Tutuala sub district.

Makuva is not a moribund language in the sense that it has a few final speakers, after whose death the language will be extinct. Speakers get only introduced to the language after they have been chosen by someone who wants to transfer his knowledge of Makuva. Usually this means a candidate will be in his sixties. In such a scenario one does not learn a grammar and a lexicon, but rather a set of phrases, which are not all readily understood anymore. Of course this does not mean that the ones who are not chosen do not know anything. At a birthday in 2003 in Mehara we attested that almost everybody could produce some sentences and phrases in Makuva as long as they were drunk. When sober nobody dared to inform him on anything related to the language.

Since leading clans like Cailoru Ratu use Makuva as a ritual language, we hypothesise that actually all clans in the region used it as a dialy language before the allegiance shift towards Fataluku began, which ended in Tutuala subdistrict in the early 70-ies of the preceding century. The fact that scientists focused on the ‘aberrant’ or ‘non-Fataluku-like’ Porlamano and its inhabitants was in a way induced by the surrounding clans to prevent outsiders to touch upon an element in their cultural framework that was considered very intimate and private.

This tendency of oromainu ‘secrecy’ is very salient in Tutuala society and can be considered an intrinsic feature of Fataluku culture. Secrets are important instruments in a society in which the clans try to maintain a power equilibrium that is easily destabilised. As has been explained in paragraph 2, each clan has alliances with several other clans. Otherwise said, clan A may have an alliance with clan B. Clan B also maintains an alliance with clan C, but clan C and clan A are openly arch enemies. The relation between B and C is therefore hidden from the

45 The fact that the couple also bore the same as the Portuguese anthropologist António de Almeida may have been a decisive element in their choice to bring the language in the open to him.

46 The interpretation of Fataluku malai meaning ‘foreign’ is widespread in both the academic and layman’s world. A condensed form of the hypothesis is that Fataluku malai is ultimately derived from the Tetum word malai ‘foreigner’, which is derived from the Malay word melayu ‘Malay’. Although it certainly true that the word malai is used in noble names, the often presumed link with between ‘stranger’ and ‘king’ (as in Sahlins 2008), may be purely accidental here. It is very conceivable that Fataluku malai [malai] ‘king’ is actually derived from the Fataluku ma a-la’i (NOM-lord) ‘who acts as a lord’. Although Tetum malai [malai] is nowadays also used to refer to strangers, the actual word for it is kela. Observe also the difference in stress between the Fataluku word for king (stressed on the first syllable) and the Tetum word for ‘foreign’ (stressed on the last /a/).
public. Clan A and C could have a common ancestry but something happened in their mutual past, both clans split and became arch-enemies. That information, however, also needs to be hidden from the public.

McWilliam (2007b) suggests that the genetics of a language and the cultural patterns of its society do not need to coincide. He elaborates how Fataluku society notwithstanding its ‘non-Austronesian’ language appears to have a culture that is fully in tune with the ones on Timor Island that do have an Austronesian language. Almeida’s (1982:147-148) research clearly shows that although the Fatalukus seem closer related to the other Timorese people speaking a ‘non-Austronesian’ language (e.g. Makasai and Bunak)\(^{47}\), it are rather the Makuvas and not the Fatalukus that are genetically apart from the other Timorese peoples. Although the link to the ‘non-Austronesian’ languages of Pantar and Alor, and as such to the Trans New-Guinea phylum (Naerssen 2008) appears indisputable, Fataluku as a language fully adapts to the linguistic and literary structures found in the region. The few ‘non-Austronesian’ features that do exist enable the linguist to distinguish the Makuva structures from the Fataluku structures. However, from an anthropological point of view, it were only the Lovaia people that were distinguishable from the others. The fact that some among them still knew Makuva caused outsiders to believe that it was their language and that it disappeared along with the few elderly people in Porlamano.

We consider Makuva not to be a dying language, but rather a language ‘in coma’. When Ferreira (1951b) pointed at the bad condition of the language, he was talking about an ongoing situation in Porlamano and Loikere. This situation only began in Tutuala (and Pitileti) in the sixties of the last century, but definitely will take a similar route of mystification and subsequent secrecy.

This phenomenon has specifically been attested in the languages of Southwest Maluku (e.g. Florey and van Engelenhoven 2001) and the ones that migrated along with its speakers to The Netherlands in the 50-ies of the last century (Engelenhoven 2002). It is exactly this feature that suggests a close link between Tutuala subdistrict and the islands of Southwest Maluku (Engelenhoven and Hajek 2000, Hajek, Himmelmann and Bowden 2003).

This strategy has proven not to be the best way to safeguard one’s language in Southwest Maluku and in The Netherlands. It is therefore very important that the people of the Tutuala subdistrict learn that there are better ways to safeguard their linguistic heritage than through ‘language concealment’. This is a task linguists can assist with.
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